



11B  
vowell

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of:

**Thekkath et al.**

Appl. No. 09/364,786

Filed: July 30, 1999

For: **Processor Having a Compare  
Extension of an Instruction Set  
Architecture**

Confirmation No.: 9876

Art Unit: 2672

Examiner: Chung, Daniel J.

Atty. Docket: 0077.20

(1778.0120002)

**RECEIVED**

APR 16 2003

Technology Center 2600

**Amendment and Reply Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.111**

Commissioner for Patents  
Washington, D.C. 20231

Sir:

In reply to the Office Action dated **December 31, 2002**, (PTO Prosecution File Wrapper Paper No. 9), Applicants submit the following Amendment and Remarks. This Amendment is provided in the following format:

- (A) A clean version of each replacement paragraph/section/claim along with clear instructions for entry;
- (B) Starting on a separate page, appropriate remarks and arguments. 37 C.F.R. § 1.121 and MPEP 714; and
- (C) Starting on a separate page, a marked-up version entitled: "Version with markings to show changes made."

It is not believed that extensions of time or fees for net addition of claims are required beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this paper. However, if additional extensions of time are necessary to prevent abandonment of